



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

	THE DIG DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
APPLICATION NO.	97/14/1997	TAKU YAMAGAMI	35.G1994	6547
08/892,092			EXAMINER	
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO 30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA			VILLECCO, JOHN M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
NEW YORK,	NEW YORK, NY 10112		2612	34
			DATE MAILED: 06/08/200	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	08/892,092	YAMAGAMI, TAKU			
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John M. Villecco	2612			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	l ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address			
THE REPLY FILED 11 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.  Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. See MPEP ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under have been filed is the date for purposes of determini					
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
2 The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(1) The provision the issue of new matter (see Note below):					
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the					
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.  NOTE:					
a D A religion the rooky has overcome the following rejection(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly					
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to:					
Claim(s) rejected: <u>58-63</u> .					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).					
10. Other:  WENDY R. GARBER  WENDY R. GARBER  SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  SUPERVISORY CENTER 2600					

MANNE GIVAN

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding claims 58 and 60, applicant argues that the combination of Sakagami, Saito, and Redford fail to disclose recording on a detachable recording medium, a file including generated image data or voice data using a determined file name obtained by retrieving information pre-recorded in the detechable recording medium. However, since the claims are so broad, the examiner is interpreting the image data being read out of the memory card as the "information pre-recorded in the detachable recording medium". By reading out th information stored on the memory card, the system knows the filenames of the images stored there. When used in conjuction with Saito, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to name a file to be stored on a memory card differently from the files already stored on the memory card in order to avoid memory loss due to naming conflicts. See abstract of Saito. Therefore, the rejection from the previous office action will be upheld.